	Case 4:12-cr-40055-TSH Document 430 Filed 11/16/15 Page 1 of 33		
		1	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS		
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS		
3			
4	United States of America,)		
5	Plaintiff,)		
6	vs.) Case No. 12CR40055-1-TSH		
7			
8	Anthony Wooldridge,) Defendant.)		
9			
10	BEFORE: The Honorable Timothy S. Hillman		
11			
12	<u>Sentencing</u>		
13			
14			
15	United States District Court Courtroom No. 2 595 Main Street Worcester, Massachusetts July 20, 2015		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22	Marjanno Kuga-Dull DDD CDD		
23	Marianne Kusa-Ryll, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter United States District Court 595 Main Street, Room 514A		
24			
25	Worcester, MA 01608-2093 508-929-3399 justicehill@aol.com Mechanical Steno - Transcript by Computer		

Case 4:12-cr-40055-TSH Document 430 Filed 11/16/15 Page 2 of 33 APPEARANCES: United States Attorney's Office Cory S. Flashner, Assistant United States Attorney Greg Friedholm, Assistant United States Attorney Donohue Federal Building & Courthouse 595 Main Street, Suite 206 Worcester, Massachusetts 01608 on behalf of the Government Law Office of Raymond A. O'Hara Raymond A. O'Hara, Esquire 1 Exchange Place Worcester Massachusetts 01608 on behalf of the Defendant, Anthony Wooldridge

1 PROCEEDINGS (The following proceedings were held in open court 2 before the Honorable Timothy S. Hillman, United States District 3 Judge, United States District Court, District of Massachusetts, 4 5 at the Donohue Federal Building & United States Courthouse, 595 Main Street, Worcester, Massachusetts, on July 20, 2015.) THE CLERK: All rise. Court is now open. You may be seated. 8 Case No. 12-40055, United States versus Anthony 9 03:03:30PM 10 Wooldridge. 11 Counsel, please note your appearance for the record. MR. FLASHNER: Corey Flashner on behalf of the United 12 13 States. MR. FRIEDHOLM: Good afternoon, your Honor. Greg 14 Friedholm on behalf of the United States. 03:03:37PM 15 16 THE COURT: Good afternoon. MR. O'HARA: Good afternoon, your Honor. Raymond A. 17 O'Hara on behalf of Mr. Wooldridge, who is present. 18 19 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. O'Hara; and good 03:03:49PM 20 afternoon, Mr. Wooldridge. 2.1 THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon. 22 THE COURT: Just give me one second, please. 23 (Probation conferred with counsel.) 24 THE COURT: Okay. Just to set the record, we are here 03:04:31PM 25 for Mr. Wooldridge's sentencing; and in preparation for that, I

1 have read and reviewed Ms. Roberts', as always, excellent presentence report, which was prepared on May 6th; although 2 there was a pre-plea report prepared on April 7th, and then the 3 4 report was revised on July 1st. 03:05:01PM 5 In addition, I have received and read Mr. O'Hara's 6 sentencing memorandum that was dated on July 16th, and attached to it were a number of very helpful communications from family 7 and friends of the defendant. There was some medical 8 information attached to it as well. I'm unaware of any other 9 03:05:37PM 10 materials. 11 Is the government aware of anything that I missed? MR. FLASHNER: I'm not, your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Mr. O'Hara? 14 MR. O'HARA: No, I assume that you're acknowledging the receipt of Dr. Mendoza's report? 03:05:47PM 15 16 THE COURT: That's correct. MR. O'HARA: Okay. All right. And then -- because 17 what I did is I filed a redacted copy on line, and I just did 18 19 that on my own. It wasn't that much that had to be redacted. 03:06:03PM 20 There were just a few paragraphs so rather than --2.1 THE COURT: I did get the --22 MR. O'HARA: Rather than having the entire thing filed 23 under seal -- I think I learned that with Judge Saylor -- I redacted what I felt were the sensitive portions and filed 24

everything else directly with you in the unredacted form.

03:06:16PM 25

1 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. O'Hara, while you were -- while you were up, have 2 you had a chance to not only review the presentence report but 3 to go over it with Mr. Wooldridge? 03:06:32PM 5 MR. O'HARA: Yes. 6 THE COURT: And, Mr. Wooldridge, do you feel that you have had enough time to go through the presentence report, and 7 are you prepared to move forward today? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 03:06:40PM 10 THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to 11 start by just going through the offense-level calculations because I know, Mr. O'Hara, you wanted to take issue with some 12 13 of that, and then I will go to the criminal history 14 calculations and then the sentencing options. 03:07:04PM 15 So the offense-level computation is as follows: 16 defendant presents with a base offense level of 32, and to that there were no adjustments for role, victim related, or 17 obstruction of justice; and from that there was a two-level 18 19 deduction for acceptance of responsibility. 03:07:37PM 20 And is the government prepared to make a motion on a 2.1 third-level reduction? 22 MR. FLASHNER: Your Honor, the government would so 23 move. THE COURT: All right. Now, because of the 24 defendant's career offender status, that makes the career 03:07:51PM 25

2.1

03:08:18PM 5

03:08:38PM 10

03:09:01PM 15

03:09:21PM 20

03:09:44PM 25

offender offense level at 37 from which again there is a three-level deduction for a total career offender level -- offense level of 34.

Mr. O'Hara, you wanted to be heard on the attributable weight?

MR. O'HARA: Yes, your Honor. Based upon -- the Court was not required to make specific findings as to why it held that Mr. Wooldridge was responsible for more than the 280 grams, which triggers the 120-month mandatory sentence, and when I reviewed the -- my notes of what happened during the seven-day trial in February, it wasn't clear to me how the Court had arrived at that -- at that number.

There were conversations that were recorded indicating that Mr. Wooldridge delivered 200 of something. Back, I believe, on June 25th or June 27th of 2012, after that conversation and after Mr. Wooldridge was observed by law enforcement interacting with Mr. Hernandez, there were conversations between Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Dunston regarding the cooking process.

Subsequent to those conversations, Mr. Wooldridge then appeared on the -- significantly during the wiretap interacting with Mr. Hernandez towards the end of July, and there was an indication that Mr. Hernandez had received 300 grams of powder cocaine from one of his sources, and that 300 grams was cooked up by Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Dunston and then divided between

2.1

03:10:02PM 5

03:10:21PM 10

03:10:43PM 15

03:11:02PM 20

03:11:21PM 25

Mr. Hernandez, Dunston, and Mr. Wooldridge, who each got approximately 100 grams.

Mr. Wooldridge was subsequently arrested shortly after those conversations were recorded, and he was in possession of 93 grams of crack cocaine.

After that, Mr. Wooldridge kind of disappears from the telephone calls. And by the middle of August, his conversations with Mr. Hernandez are extremely limited and rare, and it's during that time period between the middle of August and the end of August that Mr. Hernandez is heard making arrangements with Mr. Cruz, Compi, for the delivery of the 500 grams that are later intercepted through the Postal Service. He's also involved with protracted negotiations through a female friend of his to have the stuff delivered to her surreptitiously saying he was receiving some kind of gift from his girlfriend. And there are limited conversations between Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Dunston about that arrangement. There are no conversations between Mr. Wooldridge and Mr. Hernandez about what Mr. Hernandez's plans are with Compi.

So there are a variety of ways that the Court could have arrived at 200 grams of cocaine. It would require that the 200 of whatever Mr. Wooldridge delivered to Dunston and Hernandez back in June was converted to crack and that he reasonably should have foreseen that. Obviously, the 93 grams that are found on his person, he's responsible for. We've

never contested that, nor have we ever contested his part in the conspiracy.

So my argument is that he shouldn't be held accountable for 500 grams that Mr. Cruz, Compi, was sending up to Hernandez the end of August, and that in a worst-case scenario he shouldn't be held accountable for more than the -- I believe it's 800 grams, which triggers a level 34.

All of what I'm saying, of course, is trumped by the fact that based upon his criminal record, he does classify and qualify for career offender status. And I'll address that in a moment.

THE COURT: Thank you.

03:11:35PM 5

03:11:57PM 10

03:12:10PM 15

03:12:31PM 20

03:12:48PM 25

Do you want to be heard on that, Mr. Flashner? Are you pulling the oar on this?

MR. FLASHNER: I am. Briefly, your Honor. I think

Probation -- in short, I think Probation got it right. They

held him accountable for the other 497 grams of powder that was

sent up by Richard Cruz, or Compi, to Mr. Hernandez. There is

repeated phone calls during the course of the conspiracy

between this defendant and Sergio Hernandez asking about

sources of cocaine, and more specifically asking about Compi.

I think based upon that there's an agreement that they are going to find another source, whether it be Compi or someone else, and that there's enough to hold him accountable, and that it was reasonably foreseeable to him -- attributable

03:13:11PM 10

12

11

14

16

17

18

13

03:13:38PM 15

19

2.1

03:13:56PM 20

23

22

24

03:14:16PM 25

to him.

Thank you.

MR. O'HARA: If I could just say one other thing.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. O'HARA: At the close of the case, the government submitted a memorandum in binder form where they indicated, as I attached to my sentencing memorandum, that Mr. Wooldridge was not responsible for that amount that was delivered by Cruz/Compi; that he was only responsible for 778 grams. would ask that they be held to what they said at the close of They were present and they prosecuted it. the case.

THE COURT: All right. I do find that there was at least 497 grams attributable -- I mean that there's -- that the offense involves at least 840, but less than 2.8.

Now, tell -- talk to me about the career offender.

MR. O'HARA: Well, as I said in my memoranda, the career offender guideline, when the guidelines were more or less mandatory, was the most utilized grounds for departure by judges nationwide, and the reason that it was frequently departed from was because the criminal history status that was stated in the career offender quideline overstated a person's propensity and the seriousness of their criminal record. Mr. Wooldridge falls right into that category.

He has two offenses on his record which trigger career offender status. They only need two, and both of them were for relatively minor street-level cases involving drugs where he had private attorneys or court-appointed attorneys, pleaded guilty. In one case it was a continuance without a finding; and the second case, which happened about a year later, he was given 90 days in the house of correction.

Based upon that 90-day sentence, the continuance without a finding was revoked, and he was given 90 days concurrent on that case also. So he had 90 days in the house of correction about six or seven years before he's involved in this conduct here.

There are other cases on his record, which are minor, including a mutual assault and battery with his siblings, which was disposed of with a mutual guilty filed. His record simply is not as significant as that of somebody who would be classified as a career offender.

The Court also has information about Mr. Wooldridge regarding his problems. He is a street-level seller of -- of drugs, of cocaine and marijuana, and he was selling those quantities basically to maintain his own habit, which got worse and worse as he became more heavily addicted to opioids. So I would suggest to the Court that he is not the person that the Commission more or less pigeonholed for the career offender status. He's not a major drug dealer. He was a minor drug dealer with a heavy habit, who was involved in street sales of drugs. And as I said, his prior interactions with courts were

1 2

3

4

03:14:33PM 5

6 7

8

``

03:14:51PM 10

11

12

13 14

03:15:07PM 15

16

17

18

19

03:15:24PM 20

21

22

23

24

03:15:46PM 25

relatively minor, especially when you compare his record to that of Mr. Dunston.

So I would suggest to the Court that the sentence that's suggested by the career offender guideline in his case grossly overstates the seriousness of his past conduct and is grossly disproportionate with his offense conduct in this case and what kind of a sentence he should be, you know, imposed by the Court.

THE COURT: Do you want to weigh in on the ...

MR. FLASHNER: Your Honor, just -- just two points that I would want to make. Just so the record is clear, the government did use a chalk during its closing argument in which it submitted that Mr. Wooldridge was responsible for the 498 grams that was sent up by -- by Mr. Cruz.

The government in its argument -- I believe the argument was even if you said they only got .6, even if the conversion rate for this was only .6, it would still be 299 just as a way to give the defendant the benefit of the doubt -- benefit of the doubt. The government has never strayed from its belief, however, that it did prove a one-to-one ratio.

Setting that aside now that I think the record's accurate. With regard to the career offender, he has two prior convictions. This Court has seen career offenders with more serious offenses and career offenders that have served more

03:16:04PM 5

03:16:16PM 10

03:16:30PM 15

03:16:47PM 20

2.1

03:17:03PM 25

jail time for their prior offenses. That said, as the statute is written, I believe he does qualify.

THE COURT: Thank you. I -- I agree that he does qualify.

All right. So that makes the guideline provisions 262 to 327 months, a five year supervised release guideline, probation not authorized, and a fine of 17,500 to \$11 million. Restitution is not applicable, and there's a special assessment of \$200.

All right. Let me hear you -- from the United States first, please.

MR. FLASHNER: Thank you, your Honor.

The defendant faces actually two sets of charges.

There's the overarching conspiracy for which he's responsible for over 280 grams, and then there's Count Two of the superseding information for which he faces a five-year mandatory minimum for the over 28 grams when he's arrested with just under a hundred grams of crack cocaine back on July 31.

In looking at Mr. Wooldridge, there are really three principal transactions that he is involved in. He figures in as a supplier to Mr. Hernandez on June twenty -- and Mr. Dunston on June 25th and June 26th when he supplies them with 200 grams of powder cocaine that they then cook into crack cocaine for \$8,200.

With respect to him being a street-level user, who's

9

03:17:18PM 5

03:17:53PM 10

1112

3

4

6

7

8

13

14

03:18:06PM 15

16

17

18

19

03:18:29PM 20

21

22

23

24

03:18:48PM 25

simply satisfying his own drug habit, these are not transactions that a street-level user would be involved in.

We're talking about \$8,200 in cash for 200 grams. It's not a street-level transaction of someone who's a drug-addicted person selling 8 or 10 gems, or rocks, of crack cocaine in order to steal or have one in order to support their own habit. I think that to consider Mr. Wooldridge a street-level user of drugs is -- is -- is not what the evidence showed at trial.

Looking at -- the second incident is on July 31.

Mr. -- Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Dunston purchased approximately

300 grams of crack cocaine. Mr. Wooldridge is in contact with
them. He ultimately gets his third of that, and he's
ultimately arrested later on that evening by the Worcester

Police Department and subsequently charged in state court after
his arrest. He had approximately 98 grams on that particular
day. And then there's the 500 grams that are sent up from
Mr. Cruz that he's also attributable to.

The Court had seven days of testimony on that. The Court has sat through a lot of hearings in which it has heard evidence on all these. I just wanted to make the record fairly clear.

What concerns the government and what I want to highlight for the Court today is Mr. Wooldridge's conduct after his arrest on July 31, 2012. It's what he does and what he doesn't do.

03:19:14PM 5

03:19:33рм 10

03:19:53PM 15

03:20:10PM 20

03:20:25PM 25

He doesn't think: I got in trouble. I'm going to stop. Rather, his -- his -- his actions, and we know his words because it was a Title III intercept, are the exact opposite of that. This isn't someone who says, I'm in trouble. I'm going to stop. I have a drug habit. I'm going to stop. There's nothing like that. Rather, and I'm just going to read a couple of quotes from Mr. -- Mr. Wooldridge.

On August 2nd, just two days after he's arrested,

Mr. Hernandez received a call from Mr. Wooldridge, and

they -- they begin to discuss -- discuss Mr. Wooldridge's

situation, and Mr. Wooldridge responds that he's going to cut

everyone off and, quote, "only keep about seven or eight

people, and all the new ones can't be trusted," end quote. So

here he is two days after being arrested in state court. He

was charged with the mandatory minimum, facing serious drug

charges. He's released. And his thought is, how can I keep my

business going and not get rearrested, not get in trouble with

law enforcement again.

He's basically just deciding that he's going to continue to work as a crack cocaine dealer, and he even tells the police that day that he feels like the case against him is, quote, "was not beatable," end quote.

And then you look -- and this is perhaps the most troubling is the next day, August 3rd, 2012, just after 11:18 p.m. that day. Mr. Wooldridge and Mr. Hernandez have a

03:20:43PM 5

03:20:59PM 10

03:21:18PM 15

_,

03:21:35PM 20

03:21:54PM 25

03:22:13PM 5

03:22:27PM 10

03:22:47PM 15

03:23:06PM 20

03:23:26PM 25

phone conversation, and Wooldridge goes on and describes how he's going to limit his potential exposure to law enforcement since his arrest. And he states, quote, I got like five people that want like 100 pieces, and then I need to like get a seven, nigga. I'm only fuckin' -- I know there's a lot of family, and there are some young children in here. If they want to take them out, I suggest they do it now. The language is not something they may want to not choose to have their children hear.

And then I need to get a seven, nigga. I'm only fuckin' with like seven people, nigga. People that never leave their crib. People that I've dealt with since I was a kid. People that I just go to their crib. So even if I only have eight or nine people right now, I'm cutting off like 50 people. I don't even give a fuck. I just want to make a few dollars, like, you can't get me a seven right now.

And what Mr. Wooldridge is saying there is he's asking Mr. Hernandez to get him a seven, to get him some -- a quantity of crack cocaine, and he's indicating that he's going to deal to people that he can trust and people that he doesn't think that will get in trouble with because he goes to their house or their crib and sell to it. But he also says that he's cutting off, like, 50 people. Cutting off 50 people. Those are 50 people who -- who like Mr. Wooldridge -- who are like Mr. Wooldridge in some sense because they're sons and daughters and

fathers and mothers and nephews and nieces to someone. But those people are the people who he, instead of going to work every day, getting up at 9:00 a.m., these are the people who he's serving. He's serving them with drugs, and he's pumping those drugs right back into the community. Fifty people by his own words.

To consider him a street-level dealer, your Honor, he is just not. He's engaging in at least 200-gram transactions that we know -- 200 grams in a single transaction for over \$8,000. He's servicing, by his own words, at least 50 different clients at least at one point. At least at this point. He is out there, and he is selling drugs to people in this community, and that's what he's doing.

If you look at his prior history, and I'm not -- I'm not going to sit here and pound the table and suggest that this Court hasn't seen career offenders with worse histories. Of course it has. Has Mr. Wooldridge ever been indicted? No, he hasn't. Has he ever served jail time? Yes, he has. Has he ever served state prison time? No, he hasn't. I mean, he received a -- in 2005, distribution of Class B and Class D. He received a -- I want to make sure it is Class B, your Honor.

Class -- Class B and Class D, he received a continuation without a finding, and then he ends up with six months committed. But that was back in '05. This case happened in '12. That's seven years earlier. So he has been

03:23:47PM 5

03:24:05PM 10

03:24:23PM 15

03:24:42PM 20

03:25:05PM 25

dealing drugs for seven years. He got arrested then. He received a break. The state court gave him a continuation without a finding, which if he had just stayed out of trouble, this Court well knows, it ultimately would have read on his criminal history as a dismissal. He is unable to do that.

And then in 2006 he's arrested again for possession of D with the intent to distribute. And he's arrested again.

It's not an incredibly large quantity of crack cocaine, but he's arrested with crack cocaine, and he receives a 90-day committed sentence at that time. Two prior drug distributions in his history.

Are they the most serious career offender predicates this Court has ever seen? No, but are they illustrative of Mr. Wooldridge and the fact that he's dealing drugs. He has been dealing drugs for the past seven years.

His criminal history, as it's relayed in the PSR, also does contain some history of violence. There's no shootings.

There's no stabbings, but there is some history of violence.

It's violence within -- most of it, the convictions at least, are continuations without a finding are for violence that happened within his family. These dating back from '06 and '05 as well. There are some other assault and battery arrests, but those are not convictions.

In terms of an appropriate sentence, your Honor, there is a mandatory minimum sentence on Count One of ten years, and

03:25:25PM 5

03:25:43PM 10

03:25:59РМ 15

03:26:14PM 20

03:26:30PM 25

there's a mandatory minimum sentence of five years on Count Two.

2.1

03:26:44PM 5

03:27:04PM 10

03:27:21 PM 15

03:27:42PM 20

03:28:00PM 25

The Court has within its discretion to run those consecutive or concurrent, and the defendant's guideline sentencing ranges is well above that. It's -- it's -- the low end of that is over 20 -- approximately 22 years. 262 months. That is a very long sentence, and the government is not going to stand here and ask you to impose the minimum career offender sentence.

The government is also cognizant of the previous sentence -- sentences that defendants have received in this case; and in fairness, the government has stated almost since the time of the initial appearance in this case that Mr. Hernandez was at the top of this; Mr. Dunston was a very close second; and Mr. Wooldridge was a fairly distant third. And the government is -- I would be remiss if I didn't state that again. The government has requested sentences of, I believe, 20 years for Mr. Hernandez. I believe it was 19 years for Mr. Dunston. Mr. Hernandez hasn't been sentenced.

Mr. Dunston received a 12-year sentence. The government took that into consideration, but the government is aware of the guidelines and is aware of the purpose of the guidelines as well as the 3553(a) factors.

Looking at all those factors and looking at this defendant's history of drug dealing, the government feels that

a significant sentence is warranted, and the government would recommend the following: We would recommend a 15-year sentence on Count One, the conspiracy count; a five year committed sentence to run concurrent on Count Two; a five-year period of supervised release, which is the minute -- the minimum period of supervised release required by statute on both counts to run concurrent; a \$100 special assessment on both counts -- on each count, rather; and a forfeiture as alleged in the indictment. That would be the government's recommendation given this defendant, given his prior history, and given some of the other factors that I'm sure Mr. O'Hara will get into during the course of his discussion with the Court and his argument to the Court concerning Mr. Wooldridge's upbringing and some of the hurdles and obstacles that he had to overcome during that time period.

Thank you.

MR. O'HARA: If I could just say one thing. I have to step back, but I want to make sure I'm not messing up more than I already have. We're not conceding, and I don't believe there was any evidence produced at trial indicating that there's a one-on-one conversion rate between powder cocaine and crack cocaine. And in my sentencing memorandum I included a conclusion that was made in a case a couple of months ago with Judge Zobel where she made the same statement. The government at the close of the case in its chalk indicated that it also

tended to agree with the testimony of the expert, who testified basically without objection, that the 492 or '95.2 grams of crack cocaine that had been delivered by Mr. Cruz to Mr. Hernandez could not have been converted into a similar amount of cocaine powder. So I just want the record to reflect that we're not acquiescing in the argument that the 500 grams that were delivered by Mr. Cruz to Mr. Hernandez would have converted into 500 grams of cocaine base. And that is like on the tail end of my argument that he shouldn't have been accountable for any of that.

We also wanted the Court to know, and I want to bring this up again, just for the sake of protecting the record, that there were conversations at the end of June when he delivered 200 of whatever he delivered to Mr. Hernandez, indicating that Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Dunston at that time were selling powder cocaine, and it wasn't clear whether the entire 200 grams were converted to crack where the sum was powder. To me it wasn't clear if the Court made its ruling. I just want my objection to be reflected in the record.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. O'HARA: I also would like to thank the Court for putting up with me and my co-counsel for two weeks in February. This is new ground for me. I have never been in a situation where I had a jury-waived trial, I think ever, no less on an issue regarding weight that would affect sentencing. All my

03:30:09PM 10

03:30:28PM 15

03:30:44PM 20

03:31:02PM 25

03:31:20PM 5

03:31:39РМ 10

03:32:02PM 15

03:32:21PM 20

03:32:44PM 25

previous experience with these cases were basically arguments that were conducted at sentencing or at hearings at sentencing under a preponderance standard.

Mr. Wooldridge, your Honor, I probably have said this before, and you've heard this from other counsel. He's not the person I met when I first was appointed to represent him.

Actually, I was retained. Physically, he's about less than two-thirds of what he was when I first was encountering him.

He's also not ill. When I first met with him he was going through withdrawal. He has lost over a hundred pounds, and I recognize him because I've seen him so often during the past two and a half, almost three years, but physically he's a different person. Mentally, he's a different person. And since my representation of him has begun, he has undergone a 180-degree change in attitude.

The reports that you have from various sources, especially from Dr. Mendoza, indicate that he seems to have a predisposition towards an anxiety issue and depression, and I can attest personally from having met with him the first year of my representation that it was extremely difficult. I am not a mental health specialist, but the amount of panic and preoccupation he displayed to me was very difficult at times. And as he went through -- actually, when he was placed in Wyatt, and out of Walpole -- I don't know -- I have no idea while -- why he was placed in Walpole. It was something the

2.1

03:33:01PM 5

03:33:18PM 10

03:33:35PM 15

03:33:45PM 20

03:34:03PM 25

marshals had worked out because of overcrowding. As soon as he was removed from Walpole and placed in Wyatt, he began meeting twice a month with mental health counsellors there. They monitored his medication. They provided him with medication. They changed the medication, and his attitude has changed, and he has been given positions of significant trust within the institution as he has progressed through the treatment.

He is now given -- pretty much he's on an open

schedule with the health services, and whenever they have massive arrests like happened a couple of weeks ago in Boston with the 45 people who were picked up in Boston, a lot of those people were sent to Wyatt. He has to prepare the medical review packets before they arrive. So it's not a steady job. It's just something that he finds out about, they tell him to do it. And from what I understand, he's very good at doing it. He has got a good brain. He has a lot of potential, and unfortunately, he has --

THE COURT: There was a nice letter from Wyatt about --

MR. O'HARA: Ms. Singleton, yeah. And also, I included every letter that I got in support. Sometimes I edit them, or I think you have too much on your plate, but the members of his family and friends went out of their way to write letters on his behalf, and I didn't think I had the right to withhold any from your own view. And if there was a common

2.1

03:34:24PM 5

03:34:41PM 10

03:34:57PM 15

03:35:14PM 20

03:35:32PM 25

thread in those letters it was that he has a heart of gold; he's very generous; he tries to take care of people. And most of the people in his family had no idea how deeply he was addicted to opioids since his late teens. And when I first met with him more than two years ago, he was going through withdrawal symptoms. He was physically ill. He was on opioids.

Cocaine, as bad as it is, is not physically addictive. It is psychologically addictive. Heroin and opioids will kill you. They can kill you during your withdrawal. They can kill you if you keep taking them. And I don't need to bring to the Court's attention the number of people recently who have died from using heroin, which is where he was headed, if he hadn't been arrested, because what happens frequently is that people become addicted to prescription painkillers; and then when they can't get the prescriptions, they buy heroin on the street, and the potency of the heroin fluctuates to the extent that people can die. So being arrested is probably something which may have saved his life, and I think he has grown to an understanding of that.

His role in this offense, as Mr. Flashner said, is much different than that of Mr. Dunston and Mr. Hernandez. By my informal count, 85 percent of the recorded telephone calls on Mr. Hernandez's phone were between Hernandez and Dunston.

There were phone calls between Hernandez and others and Dunston

where they're talking about firearms. He was not involved, Mr. Wooldridge, with any of that.

When Mr. Dunston -- excuse me -- when Mr. Hernandez was arrested, a loaded firearm was found in the -- in the place where he was staying.

When Mr. Wooldridge was arrested, there were no firearms found. There's no violence involved in anything that he was involved in in this particular case. And I have to say that the fact that he supplied 200 grams of powder cocaine to Mr. Hernandez back in June was the only time, at least according to the wiretaps, that he did that, and we don't know where that 200 grams came from. He certainly didn't profit by \$8,200 himself for his own personal use on that.

What he was doing was he was selling small quantities of crack cocaine, \$20 and \$40 portions to street addicts in order to get enough money to support his own habit. And by being arrested in this case, we have enabled him to arrest his habit. He has done everything he could, not so much because he's looking for a shorter sentence, but because he needs help. Any program that was made available to him, and there's not a whole lot available at Wyatt, he has done, he has completed, and he has come through it in flying colors. He has also extended himself without my knowledge to other clients of mine who were incarcerated, and I found out after the fact that he had done that. He has rediscovered his religion, which he had

2.1

03:37:14PM 5

03:37:32PM 10

03:37:49PM 15

03:38:07PM 20

03:38:26PM 25

neglected and lapsed while he was using drugs, and he's involved not only in bible study, he's also conducting bible study.

The Court should be concerned based upon the number of arrests on his record. How is he going to stay out of trouble when his sentence is over? And all I can tell you is that if he's not using drugs, he will be law abiding. That's what he wants to do. And right now for the past two-plus years, he has been clean, he likes being clean, he doesn't want to fall back into that again.

As I stated in my memorandum, I specifically remember meeting with Mr. Cantino, who at the time had taken over for Ms. Cuascut as the pretrial services officer in this court, and we were working out details to have him released when he said, "No, I don't want to be released. I'm going to go back to using drugs. I can't control it. I don't want to be released. I don't want my mother putting up the house to get me out of here because I'm going to screw up. This is where I need to be until I'm clean and sober." And he's not happy being incarcerated. I don't want to state that he's not happy at all, but he has done what he could to show the Court that he's a suitable candidate for release. He looks forward to getting the 500 hour RDAP Program within the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and he welcomes the fact that when he is released he will be on conditions of release that will include mental health

2.1

03:38:42PM 5

03:39:01PM 10

03:39:19PM 15

03:39:38PM 20

03:39:58PM 25

counseling and also include narcotics counseling. And I think with those two components of his supervised release, I'm confident, and I very rarely am, that he can actually do it, he can actually turn his life around.

Ten years is what I'm asking for. Ten years is the least you can give him. I look at ten years, your Honor, my -my twins are entering their sophomore year in college. I just got the bill, and I'm like, I've got to do this for another three years. It seems like forever. He's looking at ten years, another five or six years on top of what he has already served. It takes ten years of studying to become a doctor. It takes eight to ten years to become a priest. He's at the bottom of the hill looking up, and I suggest to the Court that given the problems he has had, which are the root of his difficulties in terms of substance abuse, in terms of what he suffered as a child, in terms of his panic disorders and history of depression that you have a blueprint for success for him provided he gets alcohol and drug treatment and provided he gets psychological counseling.

In fashioning a sentence which is not longer than necessary to comport with the requirements of 18 U.S.C., 3553(a), I would suggest that 120 months is a long period of time for this man. It keeps him away from his family for at least another four or five years. He lives every day with the knowledge of what he did wrong, and I would be very, very

1	surprised and disappointed no matter what sentence he gets if			
2	he were to re-offend in the future. I think he understands			
3	what his problem is and how to deal with the problem, and that			
4	there's no easy solution, but he's willing to do whatever he			
03:40:16PM 5	can, including going into a care program or any kind of program			
6	that has heightened supervision afterwards, because he			
7	desperately does not want to be in this situation again.			
8	Thank you.			
9	THE COURT: Mr. Wooldridge, do you wish to address me			
03:40:32рм 10	before I impose sentence?			
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.			
12	THE COURT: Please do.			
13	THE DEFENDANT: Thanks for allowing me to speak this			
14	afternoon.			
03:40:40рм 15	MR. O'HARA: Speak louder into this microphone.			
16	THE DEFENDANT: I'm a little nervous, so I'm going to			
17	read off the			
18	THE COURT: It's okay. Anyway you want.			
19	THE DEFENDANT: All right. To start, first and			
03:40:53PM 20	foremost, I would like to apologize to all the victims whose			
21	lives I've damaged. I'm truly sorry and extremely heartbroken			
22	to have done such.			
23	There isn't a day that goes by that I don't think			
24	about what I've done. I'm so deep into my own problems and			
03:41:05РМ 25	addiction that I did not realize the harm I was causing, which			

is no excuse for what I did.

In the past year, I have met numerous inmates whose lives have been ruined by drug addiction, which I now know is as serious a problem as my own.

Next, I would like to thank my entire family for endless love and support. I finally realized how lucky and blessed I truly am. Not only have you all been supportive of me, but you have all filled the voids in my children's lives due to my absence.

I cannot express in words how thankful I am. To my mother and my three beautiful children, my love for you is endless. I'm embarrassed as your son, and I'm embarrassed as their father.

Mom, I know you didn't raise me to do harm. In fact, it was the opposite. You raised me to love, work hard, and always lead by an example. Despite this mess I got myself into, I know you still love me, and I want to thank you for doing so unconditionally. I hope to be home soon, and always remember that I love you dearly. I know there is more for me to accomplish in my rehabilitation, but I'm on the right track. I believe having structured my life will be the key for my success. I know I can be a positive example in my home and in my community.

So today, your Honor, I'm asking you to consider giving me the least amount of time possible so I can get home

03:41:17PM 5

03:41:32PM 10

03:41:47РМ 15

03:42:04PM 20

03:42:17PM 25

to my children and family so that I can be the father and the man I want to be.

Lastly, I want to thank my attorney Ray O'Hara for all the time he put into my case and for all of his efforts.

THE COURT: Thank you. Nice job.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Michelle.

(The Court conferred with Probation.)

MR. FLASHNER: Your Honor, just before you pronounce sentence, I just want to restate the government's position in case there is an appeal from whatever sentence the Court may impose. The government's position has consistently been that a one-to-one crack -- powder cocaine to crack cocaine ratio is appropriate in this case based upon the statements of the defendants during the case.

The chart the government used in its summation was merely meant to establish how strong the evidence was and that even giving every benefit of the doubt to the defendant, even beyond that required, or even suggested by the evidence, they would have met the standard at trial.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wooldridge, if you would stand up, please.

So pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, and having considered the sentencing factors enumerated at 18 United States Code, Section 3553(a), it is the judgment of

03:42:30PM 5

6 7

3

8

9

03:43:08PM 10

11 12

13

14

03:43:24PM 15

16

17

18 19

03:43:40PM 20

21

22

24

_

03:44:08PM 25

this Court that you should be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 132 months.

This term consists of 132 months on Count One and a term of 60 mounts on -- months on Count Two to be served concurrently.

I am going to recommend participation in the Bureau of Prison's Residential Drug Abuse Program; and upon release from imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release for a term of five years. That will consist of terms of five years on Count One and five years on Count Two to be run -- run concurrently.

I impose no fine, as I find you have no financial ability to pay such.

I am imposing the mandatory and special conditions of probation that Ms. Roberts has recommended in her presentence report, and I am adding a third special condition that you should engage -- be evaluated for, engage in, and successfully complete mental health counseling.

I'm ordering that you should pay to the United States a special assessment of \$200, which shall be due and payable immediately.

You can be seated.

You can appeal your convictions if you believe that your guilty plea was unlawful or involuntary, or if there was some other fundamental defect in the proceeding that was not waived by your guilty plea.

03:44:31PM 5

03:44:55PM 10

03:45:10РМ 15

03:45:31PM 20

03:45:44PM 25

03:46:06PM 5

03:46:28PM 10

03:46:44PM 15

03:46:52PM 20

03:47:10PM 25

You must file your notice of appeal within 14 days after the entry of judgment; and if you request, the clerk will immediately prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

So, look, there's no good news here, and I take no pleasure in this. This is just not the way you want to do things. It's not the way I want to do things. I am -- I do want to say this. I'm gratified by the fact that even while you are incarcerated, you are taking the steps to turn this thing around and get a handle on your addiction and getting engaged in the program. So that's a good thing. So, you know what, I usually tell people to make this the beginning and not the ending, and I can tell you've already done that. So that's a good thing.

The other thing is this: I can't tell you how lucky you are to have these wonderful people back here supporting you.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: It's not every day -- I mean it breaks my heart when people have got nobody back there and you know damn well that when they get out it's going to be the same old, same old. Okay. These people are here to help you, and they're here to keep you in the discipline and the things you need. And I know you're disappointed in yourself and -- and, you know, you feel you've disappointed them, but guess what, they're here because they want you to succeed, and they love

```
you. And guess what, it doesn't happen like that a lot.
         1
         2
              take advantage of this. Make this a beginning, okay, not an
         3
              ending.
         4
                       THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
                       THE COURT: All right. Anything further from the
03:47:21PM 5
         6
              government?
         7
                       MR. FLASHNER: Nothing further from the government,
         8
              your Honor.
         9
                       THE COURT: The defendant?
                       MR. O'HARA: No, your Honor.
03:47:26PM 10
        11
                       THE COURT: All right. Good luck.
        12
                       THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
        13
                       THE COURT: We're in recess.
                       (At 3:47 p.m., Court was adjourned.)
        14
        15
        16
        17
        18
        19
        20
        21
        22
        23
        24
        25
```

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Marianne Kusa-Ryll, RDR, CRR, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes before the Honorable Timothy S. Hillman, to the best of my skill, knowledge, and ability.

/s/ Marianne Kusa-Ryll	11/15/15	
Marianne Kusa-Ryll, RDR, CRR	Date	

12 Official Court Reporter